

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-33 were previously pending in the application. Claims 6-10 are canceled and claims 1, 11-16, and 26-27 are amended herein. Assuming the entry of this amendment, claims 1-5 and 11-33 are now pending in the application. The Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

In paragraph 4, the Examiner rejected claims 1-9 and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lindskog. In paragraph 7, the Examiner rejected claims 10-25 and 28-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindskog in view of Meier. For the following reasons, the Applicant submits that all pending claims are allowable over the cited references.

Independent claim 1 is amended to include the recitations of previously presented claim 10 (now canceled). Independent claim 26 and 27 are similarly amended.

The Meier reference is a U.S. patent application publication filed on July 24, 2003. Submitted herewith is a Declaration under 37 CFR 1.131, which demonstrates that (i) the present invention was conceived prior to July 24, 2003 and (ii) the Applicant exercised reasonable diligence in preparing and filing the present patent application on December 22, 2003. The Applicant therefore submits that the present invention predates Meier, that Meier is not a proper prior-art reference, and that the rejections of claims based on Meier should be withdrawn. As such, the rejections of currently amended independent claim 1 and previously presented independent claims 17 and 28-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Lindskog and Meier have been overcome. The Applicant submits that the same reasons that make currently amended independent claim 1 allowable over Lindskog and Meier also apply to the allowability of currently amended independent claims 26 and 27. Since the rest of the claims depend variously from claims 1 and 17, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable over Lindskog and Meier.

The Applicant also directs Examiner's attention to claim 15, which specifies that, when the more data bit in the first data frame informs the station that the AP has further data, the station nevertheless transmits the closing frame, thereby interrupting further transmissions from the AP. As explained on page 10 of the specification, a possible reason for the interruption can be, for example, a limitation in the particular station (STA) embodiment that imposes a restriction on the length of time for the continuous (uninterrupted) use of full awake power. The Applicant submits that none of the cited references teaches or even suggests a limitation similar to that of claim 15 when it is taken in combination with the limitations of the claims from which claim 15 depends.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicant believes that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, and early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 09/19/2006  
Customer No. 46900  
Mendelsohn & Associates, P.C.  
1500 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Suite 405  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

/Yuri Gruzdkov/  
Yuri Gruzdkov  
Registration No. 50,762  
Agent for Applicant  
(215) 557-8544 (phone)  
(215) 557-8477 (fax)